

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 8, 9 and 17-22 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 8, 17 and 18 are amended. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 8 can be found at least at page 15, line 17 - page 16, line 19 of the specification. Claim 17 is amended to be in independent form. Thus, no new matter is added.

I. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Office Action rejects claims 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite. Independent claim 17 is amended responsive to the rejection.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §101

The Office Action rejects claims 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 17 and 18 are amended responsive to the rejection.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

III. Rejection Under Prior Art

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 8, 9 and 17-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,752,716 (Nishimura) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,300,936 (Braun), and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0045935 (Chang). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The applied references fail to disclose and would not have rendered obvious "(i) calculates a plurality of vibrations corresponding to each of the vibration occurrence simulation states, (ii) sets a degree of priority for each of the simulation states depending on each of the calculated vibrations," as recited by independent claim 1.

The Office Action relies on Chang as disclosing the prioritization of vibration states. However, Chang discloses priorities that are set in advance. For example, Chang discloses at

paragraph [0050] that priorities are set to various vibration effects based on importance designated by the designer of the program. Consequently, Chang fails to disclose any sort of setting of a degree of priority for each of the simulation states depending on a calculated vibration, the calculated vibration corresponding to each of the vibration occurrence simulation states. Because Chang merely discloses a prior set vibration state, and not a vibration state based on a calculated vibration with a simulated state, Chang fails to disclose the above-quoted feature.

For similar reasons as stated above, the applied references fail to disclose and would not have rendered obvious "(i) calculating a plurality of vibrations corresponding to each of the vibration occurrence simulation states, (ii) setting a degree of priority for each of the simulation states depending on each of the calculated vibrations," as recited by independent claim 8 and similarly recited by independent claim 17.

Therefore, independent claims 1, 8 and 17 are patentable over the applied references. Claims 2, 8, 9 and 18-22 are patentable at least for their dependencies from the independent claims, as well as for the additional features the claims recite.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Linda M. Saltiel
Registration No. 51,122

JAO:VVR/jqw

Date: December 29, 2010

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry of this filing;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461